

**Savannah River Site Liquid Waste Services**  
**Request for Proposal DE-SOL-0008913**  
**Questions and Answers #3**  
**Questions #50 through #56**  
**Posted August 5, 2016**

No.	Industry Question	DOE Answer
50.	<p>C.2.6.2; At-Tank Cesium Removal (WBS: 02.06.02); Page C-39. The RFP states that “The Contractor shall also determine an acceptable interim safe storage location within the tank farms and an off-site disposal facility for the TCCR filter media and any other contaminated equipment/material not suitable for disposal at SRS.”</p> <p>Please clarify the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Should bidders assume that Ion Exchange columns have a designated safe storage location within the tank farms with adequate storage space as they are not called out in the above statement?</li> <li>2. Please confirm that DOE desires both an interim safe storage location and an off-site disposal facility for <u>both</u> the TCCR filter media and “other contaminated equipment material not suitable for disposal at SRS.”</li> <li>3. Please provide a list of locations within the tank farms that are currently available (i.e., not designated for other use) that could be used to set-up a radiological storage area for applicable equipment.</li> </ol>	<p>In response to question 50-1, Amendment 000003 to the Final RFP includes a clarification to Section C.2.6.2 to clarify the onsite and offsite storage and disposal requirements for the ion exchange columns associated with TCCR.</p> <p>In response to question 50-2, DOE’s expectation is that the Contractor will determine an interim safe storage location within the tank farms and an offsite disposal facility for: 1) the TCCR ion exchange columns; 2) the filter media; and 3) other contaminated equipment/material that are not suitable for disposal at SRS.</p> <p>In response to question 50-3, Final RFP Section C.2.6.2 requires the Contractor to determine an acceptable interim safe storage location. No such location has been designated at this time.</p>
51.	<p>Attachment L-8; Assumptions (PWS C.2.1 SDU Construction); Page L-56. The RFP states that “The DOE-provided cost for completion of SDU#7 site preparation, construction, and balance of plant activities is \$115M.”</p> <p>May DOE please provide the total cost of SDU#7 that includes work already completed (site preparation and design)?</p>	<p>DOE expects that up to \$10 million will be incurred for SDU#7 through June 30, 2017.</p>

No.	Industry Question	DOE Answer
52.	<p>Section B-10; Fee Reductions; Page B-12. This section states that all annual available fee in each year of contract performance is subject to reductions imposed by the terms and conditions of this contract, including, (3) Section B Clause entitled, Small Business Subcontracting Fee Reduction and (10) Section I Clause entitled, FAR 52.219-16, Liquidated Damages – Subcontracting Plan. Both of the referenced clauses are attributable to performance against the Small Business Subcontracting Plan, and as a result represent duplicate penalties against that performance. The Small Business Subcontracting Fee Reduction is clearly presented in Section B.11. We recommend that DOE amend Section B-10, (10) Section I Clause entitled, FAR 52.219-16, Liquidated Damages – Subcontracting Plan to include language that would not impose redundant penalties for small business performance.</p>	<p>Section B.11, Small Business Subcontracting Fee Reduction, applies to potential award fee reductions throughout contract performance. FAR 52.219-16 is applicable at contract completion, and rather allows for liquidated damages if the Contractor has failed to make a good faith effort to comply with its subcontracting plan. Award fee reductions are not the same as liquidated damages, and inclusion of both clauses conveys the importance of small business participation that DOE places on this requirement.</p>
53.	<p>Section C.1.2.2; Glass Waste Storage Buildings (WBS: 01.02.02); Pages C-21 &amp; C-22. DOE directs the contractor to continue on-going canister double-stacking activities in GWSB #1 to increase the total number of storage locations to 4,502. In the Supplemental Information section DOE states, “The steps necessary to double stack the canisters are currently ongoing”. Is it DOE's intent to have the contractor include cost for modifying the remaining canister locations to accept double-stacking? If so, can the DOE provide an estimate of the 2,251 locations that will have been modified by the end of the current contract?</p>	<p>The incumbent contractor expects to have completed 400 of the approximate 2,251 canister positions in GWSB #1 by June 30, 2017, including placement of the stacked canisters and installation of the redesigned plugs into those slots that have had the second canister inserted into the modified slots. Section C.1.2.2 states that the “Contractor shall continue on-going canister double-stacking activities in GWSB #1,” and as such the costs should be included in the proposal submission.</p>
54.	<p>H.27; DOE-H-2017 (OCT 2014); Page H-51. This clause states that the Responsible Corporate Official should be the individual that also signs the company(s) Performance Guarantee. Is it the government's intention to have a responsible corporate official listed for each company if there are multiple parent companies?</p>	<p>Yes. In accordance with DOE-H-2017, the “individual signing the “Performance Guarantee Agreement” for the parent company(s) should be the Responsible Corporate Official.”</p>

No.	Industry Question	DOE Answer
55.	Attachment J-12; GFS&I, Item 2, SRS Computing; Page J-12-1. DOE states, “DOE shall provide use of and support for government-owned SRS computing infrastructure and all related software applications, including but not limited to: PrimaVera, Site Tracking ...”. Does “support” include annual maintenance costs required by some software applications? Or, does the DOE expect the contractor to include these maintenance costs?	Use of and support for site-wide government-owned SRS computing infrastructure and all related software applications does include the associated software maintenance costs required by the software applications. This is considered GFS&I under the Functional Service Agreements (FSAs). As such, offerors do not need to include these aforementioned software maintenance costs in proposal submissions.
56.	K.5; Certification Regarding Facility Clearance – Foreign Ownership, Control or Influence (FOCI) Information; Page K-10. Please clarify what needs to be submitted with the representations and certifications for company with an existing CAGE Code or facility clearance or a new entity where listed documentation is part of the e-FOCI submittal?	Per Section K.5, appropriate items shall be checked as related to the FOCI information submitted in accordance with the instructions included in Section L.11(h). For example, if the company has an existing CAGE code that has been affirmatively cleared, then the first box for “Submitted CAGE code or facility code if cleared” should be checked. If the company is a new entity where listed documentation is part of the e-FOCI submittal, then the third box should be checked for “Facility Clearance request documentation has been submitted via FOCI ESS at <a href="https://foci.anl.gov/">https://foci.anl.gov/</a> for Offeror, subcontractor(s) and/or joint venture if not currently cleared.” Additionally, any further applicable items in the Section K.5 certification should be checked for each entity’s Section K representations and certifications.